



IDAHO FOREST STEWARDSHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Tuesday, November 22, 2011

Idaho Dept. of Lands Office, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.

Welcome and Introductions; Approval of Minutes

Chair Oscar Baumhoff welcomed everyone to the meeting and followed with introductions.

Assistant Director David Groeschl introduced himself and reported on his recent appointment as the Idaho State Forester.

A motion to approve the January 27, 2011 minutes by Ed Schneider, seconded by Mary Terra-Berns; there being no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

A motion to approve the April 19, 2011 minutes by Mary Terra-Berns, seconded by Ed Schneider; there being no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

Approval of FFY2013 Forest Legacy Applications

Karen Sjoquist, Forest Legacy Program (FLP) Coordinator, provided the following summary of FFY13 project applications and FLP subcommittee rankings:

Priority project #1: North Idaho Timber Communities Project-Phase 2, owned by Al Farnsworth. This project was previously ranked 34th nationally in FFY12, and congressional funding was not sufficient to fund this project. The revised project has been resubmitted for FFY13 and includes the Ruby Creek and Soaring Eagle parcels; the Moyie River parcel has been omitted due to its distance from the other properties.

Priority project #2: McArthur Lake Addition, owned by Stimson Lumber Company. This project is located adjacent to the FFY10 McArthur Lake project and Forest Service and State endowment lands.

Priority project #3: Boundary Connections, owned by the Hubbard and Wages families. This project was ranked 11th nationally in FFY12 and it is anticipated that this project will be funded, but because funding is uncertain, the project was resubmitted for FFY13.

Dee Sessions provided additional information on challenges for the FFY12 North Idaho Timber Communities and Boundary Connections projects. Funding has been increasingly difficult since the very first Idaho projects until now as more states are competing for limited funds. FFY12 funding will be decided when Congress passes a budget. Dee stressed that project write-ups are critical when it comes to national ranking and decisions on which projects are ultimately funded.

The committee inquired about the ability to view other states' applications. Dee will provide the committee with the link for viewing applications in the Forest Legacy Information System (FLIS) reports.

A motion by Kirk David to approve FLP subcommittee submissions as ranked, seconded by Tom Davis; there being no further discussion, the motion was approved unanimously.

Creation of Coordinating Council

Federal Authorities and Forest Service Approvals

Craig Foss thanked everyone for attending today's meeting. Craig recognized that the creation of a new advisory council to replace three existing councils is a sensitive issue and acknowledged that those present are very passionate about the Forest Stewardship Program.

Craig asked everyone to participate respectfully.

Craig introduced members from the other two coordinating councils present— from the Idaho Community Forestry Advisory Council (ICFAC) are John Bernardo, Tim Kastning, and Dave Stephenson; from the Idaho Fire Plan Working Group (IFPWG) are Mark Larson and Craig Glazier. Over the last 6 months, these council members have been joined by IFSAC's Oscar Baumhoff, John DeGroot, Robyn Miller, and Ara Andrea to discuss development of a single coordinating council.

Craig also introduced Dee Sessions and Margie Ewing, USFS-State & Private Forestry (S&PF) regional managers, who will report on the related federal authorities and various discussions they've had about Idaho's plan to create a single coordinating council. Dee stated he was initially skeptical about the idea when it was first presented, but he has since discussed the proposal with Karl Dalla Rosa and Mike Dudley. And, following S&PF review, they support Idaho's decision to restructure the stewardship coordinating committee. However, S&PF will be monitoring the new council and coach the state, if it becomes necessary. Margie explained that Idaho's Urban and Community Forestry (UCF) Program, like Idaho's Forest Stewardship Program, relies on annual program funding and must have a state advisory council. She reported on the success of Idaho's UCF Program to increase capacity since its inception. The focus of S&PF programs is now an 'all lands' approach and it's fitting and timely to merge the various advisory councils in order to move forward collaboratively with landscape-level objectives and goals for the various programs.

Craig commented that he's heard concerns expressed about what's going to happen to the traditional S&PF programs. Idaho will not be eliminating any S&PF programs and will continue to meet base-level program requirements and accomplishments. The challenge has been the competitive direction in program funding (competing for competitive grant funds with other regional states). Idaho needs to figure out how to move in the competitive direction while still maintaining base-level programs.

Craig explained the development of the August 2011 Draft White Paper. It summarizes how Idaho arrived at a proposal to develop a single advisory council. Idaho has experienced budget cuts in the last few years resulting in reduced general funding and multiple staff vacancies while, at the same time, Congress was not seeing the benefits of S&PF programs. Subsequently, the S&PF Redesign began and IDL refocused its efforts in line with the recent competitive grant process to accomplish project work that otherwise would not have happened. As part of the Redesign effort, a Forest Action Plan has been developed for Idaho. Following these program changes, IDL recognized it was stretched too thin and the need for change has become necessary. IDL's director requested staff to explore a single combined advisory council representing existing councils. In the past, the UCF Program and Forest Stewardship Program have developed and managed cost-share programs. However, due to funding changes and reductions, cost share opportunities have been either eliminated or shifted away from S&PF to NRCS. At this time, the State Technical Committee provides input to NRCS on forestry cost-share funding direction. There are no federal mandates for the Fire Plan Working Group—it is unique to Idaho. Idaho is bringing its S&PF programs together for education, outreach, and collaboration to address resource issues as a whole for the state across disciplines and programs.

John Bernardo, Idaho Power Company, reported that ICFAC recently met to discuss the single advisory council. ICFAC members understand that in today's economy with reduced funding at both the state and federal levels they can't expect IDL to operate as they have in the past. It is now necessary to continue base-level programs while at the same time reducing costs of administering the programs with multiple advisory councils. After looking into the program and its authorities, John is convinced the UCF Program will continue even if there is not a separate

urban advisory council. John, much like forest landowners at the meeting today, wants to ensure the UCF Program gets consideration but agrees it's more efficient to have a single advisory group to provide oversight. John provided examples of coordinated projects—tree canopy studies taking place in Kootenai County and the Treasure Valley. These two projects look at aspects of all three programs and will provide data that hasn't been pulled together before. It will promote forest stewardship, fire prevention, and the benefits of urban forestry.

Mark Larson, State Fire Marshall, serves on the IFPWG and is the technical expert to local fire department organizations. Mark was initially overwhelmed by forestry folks when he began serving on IFPWG. However, he's been able to bring people together on IFPWG that have different viewpoints but common interests in order to look at the bigger picture and share common experiences. The IFPWG has evolved over the last ten years sharing information among a variety of groups and coordinating efforts for grants. They've brought insights to local fire departments and helped coordinate more equitable distribution of resources.

John DeGroot provided his perspective as a forester for the Nez Perce Tribe. He participates on both IFPWG and IFSAC. With changes to the 2008 Farm Bill, more funding has become available to the tribes, whereas before they were not able to work with the state. John reported that in order to implement the Forest Action Plan (FAP), it is his opinion that it would be better to approach grants as a single advisory group because FAP addresses multiple resource issues including forest health, fire, and urban forestry. Working together on grant applications would make for a stronger proposal. John thinks it's still very important to have a strong forestry voice on the NRCS State Technical Committee. Frank Gariglio commented that NRCS has increased forestry representation on the State Technical Committee to four or five members.

Chair Oscar Baumhoff reported his participation with the oversight advisory group meetings. Oscar thinks it's a good effort and is heading in the right direction. Oscar is worried about too much influence by fire interests on the single advisory council. ICFAAC listed what should be represented on a single advisory group and there is some overlap between ICFAAC and IFSAC.

Mark Larson commented he's had similar concerns as Oscar about forestry interests having too much influence over the new advisory group. Most of the members Mark's observed on ICFAAC and IFSAC are pretty mild mannered. Mark's role and approach on IFPWG is collaborative with other the other interests. IFPWG has been recognized by fire-management peers at the national level as unique. A joint advisory council is one more way Idaho could be recognized. Mark doesn't think one program group will dominate, but has considered the possibility of this happening.

Craig commented there is no agenda developed yet for the single advisory council's first meeting because agenda-crafting will need to be a joint effort. Who is selected to serve on the single advisory council will be critical to how well they represent their interest group.

Mary Terra-Berns discussed the difficulty of working with multiple interest groups and the need to have the process more streamlined and broad-based. Once different groups understand issues from another discipline's perspective, the communication between them improves so they can ask the right questions.

Craig commented that when Peg Polichio was the Fire Plan Coordinator a number of years ago, they had the conversation about the IFPWG. Craig said he was concerned because IFPWG was getting millions of dollars to do hazard fuel treatments statewide and thought the treatments should be broader and address at forest health. He went to an IFPWG meeting where Peg proposed a broad-based project approach and the response was not positive. However, since then, Craig's seen an evolution within this particular group toward collaboration.

Following a short break in the meeting, David Groeschl commented that while it takes a fair amount of staff time to organize and participate on 3 advisory committees, this is not the only driver for the move toward a single advisory council. There has also been recognition of the need for greater integration between various S&PF programs to achieve broader landscape benefits from project work. David does not want to diminish the work of past and current advisory groups—they've been very focused and targeted. However, given the current economic climate, program funding will likely not improve either nationally or on the state level. There has been a definite trend in project funding for those that are integrated and address multiple objectives/issues such as urban forests, forest health, fire mitigation, biomass, etc. There's also been an awareness by the public and communities of how surrounding forests effect them resulting in requests for assistance. David hopes that this group and those chosen to serve on the joint advisory council will share their ideas, appreciate different perspectives, and work together on successful projects that address multiple objectives.

Review of White Paper

Draft White Paper: Moving to a Single Idaho Lands Resource Coordinating Council Structure

Craig Foss provided an overview of the draft White Paper. Craig explained that representatives from each of the 3 advisory councils were asked which interests they felt needed to serve on the new advisory council. There was overwhelming agreement “bigger is not better” when it came to how many interests would eventually serve. It was agreed that 6 interest groups from each council would be identified. ICFAC requested representation from universities (urban/bioregional planning), the Association of Idaho Cities, the Idaho Planning Association, city foresters, the Idaho Nursery & Landscape Association, and utility companies. IFSAC requested representation from the NRCS, Idaho Fish & Game, non-industrial private forest landowners (NIPF) through the Idaho Forest Owners Association (IFOA), UI Extension-Forestry, the Idaho Coalition of Land Trusts, and the Association of Consulting Foresters. The IFPWG requested representation from the BLM, the National Forest Systems (specifically fire), the Idaho Fire Chiefs, the Idaho State Fire Marshall, the Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security, and tribal representation. Additionally, the oversight group identified interests that cross program boundaries including USFS-S&PF and the Idaho Association of Counties.

Craig reported that the oversight group felt there should be co-leadership on the joint advisory council, i.e., a selected IDL staff person and council member to co-lead the meetings. The council member would serve as the chairperson and the IDL staff person would prepare the agenda, make inquiries, and so forth prior to meetings. The oversight group also agreed there should be subcommittees, as needed, and when their work was completed, the subcommittee would disband. It was agreed that IDL staff would serve and participate on the committee, but would not be voting members. One of the initial actions of the advisory committee would be to develop a simple charter outlining how the committee will operate, the content of which will be decided by the committee. For member appointments, Craig stated the same procedure will be followed as is currently done, i.e., a nomination-request letter will go out to that interest group from IDL. Following the return of the nomination to IDL by the interest group, a representative will be appointed by the State Forester.

Craig reported there are specific items that the new advisory committee will work on including periodic updates of the Forest Action Plan, review of program accomplishments, identifying data gaps and making recommendations on how to fill them, forming collaborative partnerships, advising the State Forester on policy issues, operating as a clearinghouse for different funding opportunities in combination with competitive grants, and advising the State Forester on the use of non-competitive base-level funding and other issues.

Q&A Session — New Advisory Council

Craig commented that today's meeting will be the last for IFSAC. It's Craig's hope that IFSAC will provide a recommendation today about representation on the new advisory committee. This is the same process that was followed for ICFA and IFPWG. Craig and staff following today's meeting will take IFSAC's recommendations and incorporate them into the draft White Paper and a final document will be forwarded to the State Forester. The goal is to have first meeting of new advisory committee in February 2012.

Is there concern about the loss of (specific resource) expertise when moving to a smaller advisory group? For example, there may be two tribal representatives that currently serve on different advisory councils that individually have expertise in forestry and fire. If only one of them is chosen to serve on the new advisory council as the tribal representative, there is a potential loss of either the forestry or fire perspective depending upon who is chosen to serve. Craig answered that there is no 'perfect' group especially when going from 12 individuals/interests on each of 3 councils to 18 individuals/interests on a single joint council. Margie Ewing commented that urban advisory committees have been formed with a single representative for cities with populations over 50,000 people with the idea that the representative would meet with their counterparts to communicate (advisory council) issues, receive input, and then communicate back to the council. IDL and S&PF have an expectation that this will continue as advisory council members inform their broader groups.

Dee Session expressed his concern about FSP standards and guidelines that state there must be representatives for specific groups that serve on the advisory council. The purpose of IFSAC is to represent private forest landowners. Is one representative from IFOA on the new advisory council enough? Dee is also concerned about appropriate Tree Farm representation. Craig commented this is a real problem not just for IFSAC, but for ICFA and IFPWG—you want to have the right person representing the interest.

Dee is also concerned about representing private forest landowners in other parts of Idaho, specifically the Southeast. Craig responded that the IFPWG has been more effective responding to this issue by moving their meetings around the state. Mark Larson commented that they've had visitors to IFPWG meetings in places like Eastern Idaho and they've been invited to actively participate. Ara provided the perspective that a consulting forester or extension educator would likely have contact with many more private forest landowners than an additional landowner representative. John Bernardo commented that ICFA had similar concerns as Dee's during their meeting—how do they represent cities with populations less than 50,000 that have no city forester? ICFA decided to have the Association of Idaho Cities provide representation to these smaller cities and made it clear to the representative this was their intent. Chris Schnepf commented his desire to have more forest landowner representatives on IFSAC in order to offer a more substantive voice. Chris thinks that the success of the new advisory council model will hinge on the ability of interests to have separate meetings to discuss issues unique or important to that group and then feed ideas/issues back to the joint advisory council. Craig commented this is the type of activity IDL wants.

Ed Schneider commented that among the recommended interests listed there are only two voluntary representatives while others are paid representatives. Also, perhaps invitations to more than one utility company and all of the tribes in Idaho should be considered to see if there's interest in others participating on the advisory council. Craig commented that these are good points. IDL has tried to rotate representation by various groups in the past but this has been a struggle. Ed does not want to exclude groups.

Kirk David commented that all those present today for IFSAC want to provide input about a

single advisory council. Kirk thinks it's a good concept and is interested in the nuts and bolts and practicalities of how it will work. Kirk expressed concern about 'rubber stamping' issues by members of the new advisory council if issues are of no particular interest or significance to them or their interest group. How often will the single advisory council meet? Craig reported the advisory council will meet 2-3 times a year, but he doesn't yet know if it will take longer than a day to complete all the work that needs to be done for individual meetings.

Kirk asked ICFAC and IFPWG members if they felt meeting 2-3 times per year was enough to accomplish the work they need to get done. John Bernardo commented not if they operate as Kirk has suggested. John commented that the meetings will need to be an integrated approach and the first 2 or 3 meetings will involve learning how to operate with this approach. Mark Larson commented that even though some members will be paid to attend the meetings, others will not and are volunteering their time. Therefore, the group will need to be as efficient as possible. This will put more responsibility on those that serve on the committee as well as IDL staff to prepare materials and keep members advised prior to the meetings so that meetings run efficiently.

Kirk asked if it will be necessary for members of ICFAC, IFSAC and IFPWG to meet outside of the joint advisory council meeting in order to get work done for these individual programs. Craig commented many IFSAC and ICFAC meetings have been largely information sharing and very few decisions have been made at the meetings that are critical to the future direction of the programs. Craig has in the past questioned why they're even having the meeting as reports could be communicated just as easily by email or a newsletter. Craig believes that the new advisory group will operate differently as they'll need to devote their time and resources to the bigger picture issues.

Kirk requested clarification on advising the State Forester on use of non-competitive base-level funding. Craig explained that the joint advisory group will continue to provide input on Forest Legacy Project submissions. Regarding the use of base-level funding, it will not be a placeholder on the agenda or something the committee will regularly talk about. However, if an issue comes up regarding funding and input is requested from the advisory group, this will be on the agenda.

Kirk wants to know what the venue of the combined committees will be—what will they discuss? Craig explained that they will provide input on how IDL uses funds coming out of competitive grants to maximize collaboration with multiple partners for landscape-level accomplishments. Craig commented that these are great questions, but not all of the answers have been determined yet—that will be part of the process. Dave Stephenson commented on his perspective as an IDL program manager. Dave is looking at what opportunities there are to work together with the other programs and interests on shared concerns.

Kirk commented that IFSAC has had a forestry representative to the NRCS State Technical Committee. When IFSAC goes away, who will provide that forestry representation? What are the criteria for STAC representation? Will that be lined out in the appointments by the State Forester? Frank Gariglio explained STAC representation is lined out through broad guidelines in the 2008 Farm Bill that say there should be forestry community representation. In Idaho, NRCS enlarged this to include IDL, IFSAC and tribal representatives. Frank suggested that STAC be notified of the change in advisory councils. A representative from the advisory group will be identified and invited to serve. Discussion followed on who would serve on the new advisory committee as the NRCS representative. Since the new committee will expand the range of resource concerns to also include range, minerals, urban and fire, the NRCS State Conservationist could recommend another staff person besides Frank to serve on the new advisory committee.

Margie Ewing commented that she appreciates Kirk's concerns from a program delivery

perspective. Margie explained that with new funding available to communities, tribes, and non-profits through the Community Forestry Program, there will be an increased need for outreach to these groups. In Idaho, the new advisory group could enhance the ability of these groups to access limited program funds.

Gary Hess commented that IFOA should not be viewed as just one individual landowner; it represents over 200 landowners and a significant amount of acres. They have recently ramped-up (successful) efforts to solicit input from members on forestry issues. He shares Dee's concern that there will not be that many landowners on the advisory committee, but Gary feels they have the ability to successfully communicate with IFOA members. Madeline David commented she's unable to poll Tree Farm members, so IFOA is not getting a broad enough perspective. Discussion followed about representing the interests of NIPFs statewide. Craig commented that this has been a struggle not only with IFSAC, but with ICFAC also. Craig would like to see the same network of communication that IFOA has expanded to other interests like ICFAC. The more the new advisory council can do to promote new communication networks to all its interest groups the better. Craig reported there is a North Idaho community consortium developing a website that may lead to communication with additional groups or an avenue of communication statewide.

Kirk expressed concern about how interests associated with IFSAC and ICFAC, if not doing their previous committee work, make sure that their work is getting done or issues are covered under the new advisory council structure. Dave Stephenson commented that this is a concern for IDL program managers to figure out how to share information with a larger audience outside the advisory committee. Ara Andrea commented that, as a program manager, she would want committee members to communicate with her if things that IFSAC has traditionally done are slipping through the cracks. Kirk explained that this was the reason for multiple landowners serving on IFSAC—to let the committee know what the issues are.

Discussion followed about how many private forest landowners should serve on the new committee and whether one representative is sufficient. Chris Schnepf commented this will depend upon the quality of discussions and substantive participation. Ara commented that new committee members will have the responsibility of maintaining two-way communication between the council and their interest group, more so than what was expected from previous council members. Chris commented that he does not believe this should be the responsibility of a NIPF representative but rather should extend to other interests serving on the committee. Tom Davis explained his representation to IFSAC on behalf of the Association of Consulting Foresters (ACF) and Idaho Tree Farm (TF). Tom is the current Chairman of the State Tree Farm Committee and noted a strong relationship and interaction between IFSAC and TF. Tom noted that TF representation is not on the new advisory council proposed list of members from IFSAC. Tom is concerned that if TF is not on the new advisory committee, will IDL still participate at TF committee meetings and continue to provide a link between the two? Craig commented that IDL would still attend TF committee meetings regardless of the makeup of the new advisory committee. Tom reported that Tree Farm does have the ability to apply for grants through the national ATFS program and have co-sponsored projects recently. Tom would like to see this relationship continue within the scope of joint projects. Ara commented on IDL's association with TF for the Forest Stewardship Program and the department's mission to get work done on the ground. This relationship also interweaves the work that the SFI Implementation Committee does. Ara sees this as a completely separate and necessary association between these groups, besides whatever level of interaction TF has with the current and new advisory committee.

Janet Funk joined the meeting and was introduced by Tom Davis. Janet and husband, Steve Funk, were recently named the 2011 National Tree Farmers of the Year. Janet commented that many NIPFs are at the point where they need more information about stewardship and want to provide input (through IFSAC). However, as a group, they sometimes don't know what

questions to ask. There is a concern that when streamlining the advisory groups, NIPFs will lose this support. Janet and other forest landowners are present today to say they want to continue to receive this support.

Dave Stephenson commented that during the ICFAC selection process they added individuals/groups that represent more than one interest group. Dave suggested that this may be something for IFSAC to consider so they can maximize the value of people serving. Kirk requested clarification—will IFSAC be able to say who will represent them on the new advisory committee? Craig clarified the process that ICFAC went through—thinking about those members/interests that were really critical and about people that fit the bill but also represented other interests that could serve dual roles. Craig doesn't want to completely throw open the door to changing the oversight group's original list as that would make their effort meaningless.

Tom Davis suggested that perhaps NIPF representation should include Tree Farm to maximize membership. Ed Schneider commented he understands the fairness issue of selecting 6 representatives from each program's advisory group. Ed suggested that if there are absences or non-participation from any of the original 18 interest groups, perhaps they could backfill the absence from one of the other identified interest groups. John Bernardo commented that he thinks Ed has a good idea. John supports the effort by IDL to measure effectiveness of the coordinating council in 6-12 months following initiation.

Lunch Break

Discussion of Interests Represented on ILRCC

IFSAC Draft Purpose Statement Recommendations for Stewardship

Ara asked IFSAC members while they are considering which interest groups to include as part of the new advisory committee, to look back at what IFSAC members collectively came up with when considering the group's new mission/purposes under the new world of Forest Service Redesign. The draft IFSAC Purpose Statement defines new directions for Stewardship Advisory interests identified earlier this year, and can now be used in the discussion about the make-up of the ILRCC.

A motion by Ed Schneider to adopt the IFSAC Draft Purpose Statement as presented for the remainder of the life of IFSAC, seconded by Mary Terra-Berns; there being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

Representation on ILRCC

Potential Representatives of Stewardship Program Interests

Who might best represent the prioritized private-forestland interests on ILRCC?

Craig asked IFSAC members to review and consider the list of proposed members representing forest stewardship on the Idaho Land Resource Coordinating Council (ILRCC). Are there voids and/or associations with others that are missing? Oscar commented he thinks Tree Farm should be combined with NIPF-IFOA representation.

Dee asked how S&PF will participate in the ILRCC. Ara explained counties and S&PF are common to ICFAC, IFSAC and IFPWG and will be represented on the ILRCC. Dee commented that while both he and Margie will attend ILRCC meetings, combined they will have 1 vote. Craig commented that after reviewing the voting record of both IFSAC and ICFAC for the past year, he thinks voting for ILRCC will likely be a non-issue because the new council will mostly operate around consensus. However, Craig will leave the door open for ILRCC to discuss voting. Kennon McClintock commented ILRCC will operate much like other community collaborative groups to build consensus and educate. Kennon suggested that an NIPF

representative should be a family forest landowner. The NIPF rep should be willing to bring landowner issues (from IFOA, Tree Farm, and private industrial forest landowners) to the coordinating council. Dee commented that Forest Legacy funding currently goes to private industrial forest landowners and NIPFs. However, the discussion about stewardship representation is about NIPFs, not industrial forest landowners. Craig commented that he thinks the topic of private forest landowner representation, including private industrial, should be open for discussion. Kennon commented that industry has been more active with Tree Farm in the past several years.

Gary Hess asked about ATFS representation and who is being represented—is it Idaho landowners, Idaho Tree Farmers, or the State Tree Farm Committee? Chris Schnepf commented that having an IFOA person has more attraction because IFOA has more structure and will be communicating with a larger body of forest landowners. Ed Schneider commented that IFOA and Tree Farm are two separate organizations. Ed does not agree with trying to mold them into a single representative.

A motion by Ed Schneider that ATFS be listed as a 7th (separate) option for NIPF representation on ILRCC, seconded by Tom Davis; there being no further discussion, the motion passed unanimously.

John Bernardo commented that from the urban point of view he thinks it would be best that each group has 6 reps. However, if stewardship thinks they need 7 he's fine with that because he thinks urban will still be well-represented on ILRCC. Discussion followed about consolidating the federal agency representation. Kirk David commented that NRCS rep could be heavily representing range or another resource. Chris Schnepf commented that the council will operate in an advisory capacity and at the end of the day, IDL will ultimately make decisions. Therefore, it shouldn't matter about how many votes are on the council. Dave Stephenson commented that he was the only interest representing UCF on the State Assessment of Forest Resources development committee and thinks UCF was well-represented in the final SAFR document.

Chris Schnepf requested IFSAC, ICFAC and IFPWG members receive ILRCC agendas (by email) for the first year to see what topics are being discussed and to provide an avenue for comments and/or input to ILRCC members.

Discussion continued regarding which interest groups should be included on ILRCC. Dee asked about forest health representation. Craig commented forest health is the underlying issue to all projects and should be considered when developing projects. IDL's Forest Health program manager position is still open and has historically been a strong presence at stewardship meetings. If this position is filled, IDL will consider a joint forest stewardship and forest health program manager to serve on the ILRCC.

A motion by Kirk David that the IFSAC-recommended representative for NRCS be Frank Gariglio, the recommended Idaho Fish & Game representative be Mary Terra-Berns, and the recommended UI Extension Forestry representative be Chris Schnepf, seconded by Oscar Baumhoff. Further discussion followed regarding other named representatives.

Craig clarified the appointment process—IDL staff will draft a letter on behalf of the State Forester to the various interest groups stating IFSAC is being reorganized and the current committee has recommended a specific individual to represent the interest group on the new coordinating council; IDL will request recommendations along with a list of qualifications of nominated individual(s). Upon receipt, the State Forester will consider the recommendations and make council appointments.

There being no further discussion on the motion, it passed unanimously.

Amended motion by Ed Schneider that the IFSAC-recommended representative for ACF be Mike Wolcott, the recommended representative for Idaho Tree Farm be Tom Davis, the recommended representative for IFOA be Kirk David, and the recommended representative for land trust organizations be Robyn Miller, seconded by Tom Davis; there being no further discussion, the amended motion passed unanimously.

Wrap-Up—Questions Regarding ILRCC & Final Comments

Discussion followed about how ILRCC should operate. A primary delegate and back-up/alternate representative was suggested by John DeGroot. ILRCC may need to hold meetings around the state. John commented that it will be difficult to find a single person to represent all three tribes because within each tribe there are multiple programs represented. Further discussion followed about Idaho tribal organization structure.

Gary Hess commented there are huge gains to be made by blending rural Idaho forest landowners with urban forest concerns in terms of the way stewardship and other objectives are accomplished.

(Mary Terra-Berns and John Bernardo departed the meeting at 2:00 p.m.)

Janet Funk asked that each IFSAC-identified interest name a primary representative and an alternate should the primary member be absent.

Next Steps—Timelines

Craig reported that IDL will work toward getting final ILRCC appointments and setting up the first meeting for February 2012. Craig appreciates the great discussion today and for everyone's attendance. Craig does not believe there is a huge risk involved in moving to a single advisory council. However, he does believe there is the potential for taking the programs forward and making them better.

Ara thanked IFSAC members and partners for the efforts, insights and energy they have contributed to the committee over the past 4 years. She looks forward to continuing these efforts in the future.

Ed Schneider commended IFSAC members and agency staff for their ongoing efforts.

Kirk thanked IDL for opportunity to ask questions about the new advisory council. Kirk is as optimistic as the other committees and members about the new council structure.

Craig thanked Dee and Margie for their assistance and involvement on the stewardship committee and urban council. Craig looks forward to their continued involvement with ILRCC. Craig also thanked Mike Dudley for his participation and support of the new advisory council.

Meeting Adjourned 2:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Suzie Jude

LIST OF ATTENDEES

Ara Andrea, IFSAC member (Secretary)
Chris Gerhart, guest
Craig Foss, IFSAC ex-officio
Dave Stephenson, ICFAC ex-officio
Dee Sessions, IFSAC ex-officio
Frank Gariglio, IFSAC member
Janet Funk, guest
John Bernardo, ICFAC member
Judy Adams, guest
Kennon McClintock, guest
Kurt Cutter, guest
Margie Ewing, ICFAC ex-officio
Mary Fritz, guest
Nina Eckberg, IFSAC ex-officio
Suzie Jude, guest
Tom Davis, IFSAC member

Bob Martinson, guest
Chris Schnepf, IFSAC member
Dale Dimico, guest
David Groeschl, State Forester
Ed Schneider, IFSAC member
Gary Hess, guest
Joanne Mack, guest
John DeGroot, IFSAC member
Karen Sjoquist, guest
Kirk David, IFSAC member
Madeline David, guest
Mark Larson, IFPWG member
Mary Terra-Berns, IFSAC member
Oscar Baumhoff, IFSAC member (Chair)
Tim Kastning, ICFAC member